

Armadillo Latreille, 1802 has long been in use, with three, four or more papers listed every year and a family name based on it, though it is formally invalid unless conserved by the Commission. If not, it would be replaced by the synonym *Pentheus* C.L. Koch, [1841], used only once (Dahl, 1916) since proposed; there is no family-group name based on it. In essence, the case concerns the strict priority of a generic name which has been used only twice in over 150 years, or the conservation of a name used repeatedly for nearly 200 years. I support the conservation of *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic names *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849 and *Thaumaleus* Kroyer, 1849 (Crustacea, Copepoda)

(Case 2894; see BZN 52: 245–249)

(1) David M. Damkaer

21318–195th Avenue SE, Monroe, Washington 98272–9481, U.S.A.

I agree with Dr Grygier that retaining the essentially unused name *Thaumatoessa* Kroyer in Gaimard, [1842] would jeopardize the established nomenclature of these parasitic copepods. In 1849 the author himself rejected the name by giving a new generic name, *Thaumaleus*, to the same specimen. Kroyer did not comment on the name change but he was enamoured with Greek and perhaps perceived some subtle difficulty with grammar or usage.

Kroyer's name *Thaumatoessa* predates Dana's (1849) widely used name *Monstrilla* and, as proposed in the application, should be suppressed to retain stability in Monstrilloida nomenclature. Kroyer's (1849) later and well-used name *Thaumaleus* will also be conserved for use by those who separate this taxon from *Monstrilla*.

The name *Thaumatoessa* Kroyer is of uncertain date but was likely published between 1842 and 1845. Damkaer & Damkaer (1979) chose 1845 as the most conservative date for publication, even though evidence pointed mainly toward an earlier date (para. 1 of the application). Regardless of which date is accepted, the problem with *Thaumatoessa* remains and its seniority relative to *Monstrilla* and *Thaumaleus* is unchanged.

The following comments have been received from members of the Nomenclature Committee of The Crustacean Society.

(2) A.B. Williams

NOAA/NMFS Systematics Laboratory, NHB 163, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

M.J. Grygier has pointed out the almost complete disuse of the name *Thaumatoessa* Kroyer, [1842], which was based on an illustration. There were only three uses of the name for copepods in the period 1842–1868. *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849, the name for the type genus of the MONSTRILLIDAE and the Monstrilloida, is in current

worldwide use. The genus contains more than 50 species. The name *Thaumaleus* Krøyer, 1849 has appeared in some 50 publications over the last 100 years, with increasing frequency through time.

Acknowledging the almost complete obscurity of the unused senior name, the application is justified, the long-term frequent use of its synonyms being the criterion of acceptability.

(3) Gary C.B. Poore

Museum of Victoria, 71 Victoria Crescent, Abbotsford, Victoria 3067, Australia

This is a clear case of a virtually unknown generic name having priority over *Monstrilla*, which is in wide use and is the basis of family, superfamily and order names. I support the proposal to suppress *Thaumatoessa* Krøyer in Gaimard, [1842] in favour of *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782), *A. foetidus* (Herbst, 1783) and *Aegialia rufa* (Fabricius, 1792) (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2878; see BZN 51: 121–127, 340–341; 52: 71–73)

(1) Przemyslaw Szwalko

Department of Forest Entomology, Agricultural University, Al. 29 Listopoda 46, PL 31–425 Kraków, Poland

As a non-taxonomist interested in stabilization of the nomenclature for the species currently known by the names *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782), *A. foetidus* (Herbst, 1783) and *Aegialia rufa* (Fabricius, 1792), I would like to support the majority of the arguments put forward in the application by Drs Krell, Stebnicka and Holm (BZN 51: 121–127), and to agree with Krell's subsequent comment (BZN 52: 72–73) with the exception of para. 5. I also share Dr Stebnicka's general view on the stability of these names (BZN 52: 73).

The alternative solutions to this problem of homonymy, put forward by Dellacasa (BZN 51: 340–341) and by Silfverberg (BZN 52: 71–72), however logical, cannot be easily accepted for all the taxa. I should therefore like to ask the Commission to make a ruling taking into account the following comments.

1. The name for the species known as *Dischista rufa* (De Geer, 1778), published as *Scarabaeus rufus*, is stable and need not be further discussed.

2. The name *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782) refers to a well known, widely distributed and common representative of the subfamily APHODIINAE. Besides taxonomic works it is very often mentioned in ecological and faunistic papers. Under this name it is listed in many keys and catalogues used by non-specialists. Therefore I fully support the application to conserve this name.

3. Use of the name *Aphodius scybalarius* auct. in the taxonomic sense of *A. foetidus* (Herbst, 1783) would cause much confusion since *scybalarius* Fabricius, 1781 is also in use as a senior synonym of *A. rufus* (Moll, 1782). Papers cited by Silfverberg (BZN